

tion of the book, I am rather in doubt. The book was ready for delivery in the beginning of December, but I received a notice from the binder that they had sent the books to the station in Lancaster on December 6th. A week or so afterwards I received a notice that the Pennsylvania Railroad had put an embargo on freight and that printers had removed the boxes to the Lehigh Valley Railroad. At the time I already had orders for several copies, that, of course, could not be delivered. At the Association meeting in Cambridge in December, I met Mr. Urban and he stated that the Lehigh Valley Railroad had accepted the freight but had held up the shipment just as the Pennsylvania Railroad. I received another letter dated January 3d, enclosing the shipping bill, but did not receive the books before the 21st of January, when the first customer received a copy. Now, the question is, what is the date of publication? The books were ready for shipment in December, but on account of the embargo on freight in order to favor coal shipping, I was incapable of delivering any books until late in January. The book bears on the title-page 1922, and if the date of actual publication is set to the 21st of January, the title page is a liar! You can do just as you please.

Very truly yours,
P. A. RYDBERG.

Without repeating Rydberg's pointed commendation of the title-page of his 2d edition to the Ananias Club, it is clear that one can not do just as he pleases. The specific statement that he "did not receive the books before the 21st of January [1923], when the first customer received a copy" sufficiently answers Rydberg's not very logical question as to "what is the date of publication?". Certainly any author of a competing name effectively published prior to January 21, 1923, has the right-of-way. Rydberg was truly unfortunate in encountering, first, war-conditions and, second, a coal strike. Should competition of names arise, it will be important to have the above letters from him on record.

EUPHORBIA PILULIFERA IN MICHIGAN

OLIVER A. FARWELL

TONS of this plant are annually imported from India for the purpose of manufacturing it into medicine. I have found a plant on waste grounds at Detroit that is this species. Undoubtedly seed has fallen from the bales as they were unloaded from the cars or while on their way to the factory. The plant imported is pubescent with conspicuous yellow hair. In the Detroit plant, the bright yellow of the pubescence is in the main conspicuous by its absence. It was first observed and collected at Detroit, September 5, 1930, no. 8756. It

spread somewhat the two following years but 1933 seemed to be a poor year for it. I left Detroit that year and cannot say if it has maintained its foothold or not. The imported plant is large and much branched. The plant, as it is found in Detroit, is small and simple with mainly a colorless pubescence, due probably to the unsatisfactory location and poor soil, probably not of the proper character to produce vigorous plants.

There seems to be considerable difference of opinion as to what name this species should bear. N. E. Brown in the *Flora of Tropical Africa*, vi.¹ 497 (1911) adopts *E. hirta* L. on the grounds that the herbarium specimen of Linnaeus labeled *E. pilulifera* was the type of the Linnean description of *E. pilulifera* and that the herbarium specimen is *E. parviflora* L., one of the forms of the polymorphous *E. hypericifolia* L.; hence, *E. hirta* L. is the proper name for it since *E. pilulifera* becomes a synonym of *E. hypericifolia* L.

Thellung in Ascherson & Graebner's *Syn. Mitteleurop. Fl.* vii. 424, 425 (1916) declines to accept the argument of N. E. Brown on the ground that Linnaeus had no description of his own in the *Sp. Pl.* i. 454 (1753) of *E. pilulifera*, hence the herbarium specimen could not be the type. He accepts the citation of Burman *Thes. Zeyl.* 224, t. 105, fig. 1 as the type of *E. pilulifera* L. This makes it synonymous with *E. hirta* L. published on the same page; as Grisebach first united these two species under the name of *E. pilulifera* and was followed by Boissier in *DC. Prodr.*, *E. pilulifera* L. is the proper binomial to use. Thellung agrees with N. E. Brown only in calling the Linnean herbarium specimen *E. parviflora* L. The premise of N. E. Brown is wrong from the start, for he is forcing upon an ancient botanist a "type" for his species when that botanist had no type and knew not the meaning of the word as it is expounded by botanists of the current times. One of the citations must be the type of the species; long-established custom has made it the Burman citation which makes it synonymous with *E. hirta* L.; and as shown by Thellung *E. pilulifera* is the proper name to use. *E. hypericifolia*, *E. hirta* and *E. pilulifera* were published by Linnaeus on the same page and in the order just given.

LAKE LINDEN, Michigan.

Volume 38, no. 452, including pages 273-300, was issued 7 August, 1936.